EXHIBIT A

FILED
DEC. 31, 1974
JAMES F. DAVEY, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Civil Action
No. 74-1812

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
an Illinois Corporation, on
behalf of its member cities,
1620 Eye Street, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20006,

THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE,
a District of Columbia Corporation
on behalf of its members,
1150 Seventeenth Street, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20036,

The State of ARIZONA
N. Warner Lee, Attorney General
State Capitol
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY, Tennessee
Milton H. Sitton, Director of Law
204 Courthouse
Nashville, Tennessee 37201,

The City of SALT LAKE CITY, Utah
Roger F. Cutler, City Attorney
101 City and County Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114,

The City of LOMPOC, California
Alan Davidson, City Attorney
119 West Walnut Avenue
Lompoc, California 93436,

The City of CAPE GIRARDEAU, Missouri
Thomas Utterback, City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
Cape Girardeau, Missouri 63701,

Plaintiffs,

and

The State of CALIFORNIA,
State Capitol,
Sacramento, California 95814

by and through

EVELLE J. YOUNGER,
Attorney General, on
behalf of the People of
the State of California,

RONALD REAGAN
Governor,

VERNE ORR
Director, Department of Finance,

JAMES G. STEARNS
Secretary, Agriculture and Services Agency,

FRANK J. WALTON
Secretary, Business and Transportation Agency,

NORMAN B. LIVERMORE, JR.
Secretary, Resources Agency,

JAMES E. JENKINS
Secretary, Health and Welfare Agency,

Plaintiffs-Intervenors,

and

The State of INDIANA
Theodore L. Sendak, Attorney General
State Capitol
Indianapolis, Indiana,

The State of IOWA
Richard C. Turner, Attorney General
State Capitol
Des Moines, Iowa 50319,

The State of MARYLAND
Francis B. Burch, Attorney General
One South Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202,

The State of MASSACHUSETTS
Robert H. Quinn, Attorney General
State House
Boston, Massachusetts 02133,

The State of MISSISSIPPI
A. F. Summer, Attorney General
State Capitol
Jackson, Mississippi 39105,

The State of MISSOURI
John C. Danforth, Attorney General
Supreme Court Building
Jefferson Building, Missouri 65101,

The State of MONTANA
Robert L. Woodahl, Attorney General
State Capitol
Helena, Montana 59601,

The State of NEBRASKA
Clarence A. H. Meyer, Attorney General
State Capitol
Lincoln, Nebraska 65809,

The State of NEVADA
Robert List, Attorney General
Supreme Court Building
Carson City, Nevada 89701,

The State of NEW HAMPSHIRE
Warren B. Rudman, Attorney General
State House Annex
Concord, New Hampshire 03301,

The State of OKLAHOMA
Larry D. Derryberry, Attorney General
112 State Capitol
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105,

The State of OREGON
R. Lee Johnson, Attorney General
100 State Office Building
Salem, Oregon 97310,

The State of SOUTH CAROLINA
Daniel R. McLeod, Attorney General
Hampton Office Building
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

The State of SOUTH DAKOTA
Kermit A. Sande, Attorney General
State Capitol
Pierre, South Dakota 57501,

The State of TEXAS
John L. Hill, Attorney General
Supreme Court Building
Austin, Texas 78711,

The State of UTAH
Vernon B. Romney, Attorney General
State Capitol
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114,
The State of WASHINGTON
Slade Gorton, Attorney General
Temple of Justice
Olympia, Washington 98504,

Plaintiffs-Intervenors,

v.

The Honorable PETER J. BRENNAN
Secretary of Labor
of the United States,

Defendant.

Per Curiam:

Petitioners, individual cities and states, the National League of Cities, and the National Governors' Conference, challenge the 1974 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), Public Law 93-259, 88 Stat. 55, amending 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq.* (1970), as beyond the power of Congress under the Commerce Clause in that they purport to extend the coverage of the FLSA to nonsupervisory state and municipal employees, including police and firemen. The amendments generally went into effect on May 1, 1974; provisions relating to overtime pay of police and firemen become effective on January 1, 1975. Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment and temporary and permanent injunctive relief. Defendant opposed a temporary injunction, and moved to dismiss the action for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. A three-judge district court was duly convened. We grant defendant's motion to dismiss the complaint.

Although plaintiffs have raised a difficult and substantial question of law, we feel that our decision is controlled by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Maryland v. Wirtz,* 392 U.S. 183 (1968).[1] Upholding the constitutionality of an earlier extension of the FLSA to cover employees of state-operated schools and hospitals against an attack similar to that lodged here, Justice Harlan, writing for the court, found a sufficient and independent rational relationship of the provisions of the Act to interstate commerce in that state hospitals and schools were significant purchasers of out-of-state goods and that strikes and work stoppages involving their employees would consequently interrupt and burden the flow of goods across state lines. 392 U.S. at 194-95. Since it is uncontested that the state and municipal institutions whose employees are reached for the first time by the 1974 Amendments do make substantial purchases in interstate commerce of equipment and other goods, the decision in *Wirtz* disposes of this case.

Although the theory described above was an explicitly independent ground for the decision, there is language in the opinion that stresses that the state competes with private institutions which also operate schools and hospitals.[2] The institutions whose em-

---

[1] In this opinion we have not addressed ourselves to any issue concerning the regulations and rulings issued by defendant under the 1974 amendments, either as to procedure followed, or as to substantive compliance with the Act. These issues were not the core of the complaint filed, and the contentions may be presented by plaintiffs either by way of defense, or in actions for declaratory relief. *See* National Automatic Laundry and Cleaning Council v. Shultz, 143 U.S.App.D.C. 274, 443 F.2d 689 (1971).

[2] *See, e.g.,* "If a State is engaging in economic activities that are validly regulated by the Federal Government when engaged in by private persons, the State too may be forced to conform its activities to federal regulation." 392 U.S. at 197.

ployees are in question here perform governmental functions, not seriously in competition with private industry. Moreover, there is evidence that the impact of the 1974 Amendments, in terms of confusing and complex regulations and an enormous fiscal burden on the states, is so extensive that it may seriously affect the structuring of state and municipal governmental activities by reducing flexibility to adapt to local and special circumstances, as through compensatory time off arrangements, rather than time and half overtime pay, and through other local governmental agreements.[3]

Plaintiffs contend that the amendments will mean either increase in local government fiscal requirements, or reduction in services and personnel, with layoffs, or both, due to provisions in state and municipal constitutions, charters, statutes and ordinances, like those against deficit financing. Plaintiffs further contend that a large part of the budgets of state

[3] California, for example, has a mutual aid program, through which counties cooperate to provide aid in time of floods and other disasters. The municipalities and counties participate gratuitously, without reimbursement. Council for California fear that the overtime pay provisions of the Amendments will prove so burdensome that counties will be unwilling to continue to cooperate in this venture.

Also, compensatory time-off arrangements which allow for heavy working seasons during the summer, for forest fire fighters, or during the winter, for snow removal personnel, may be prohibited by the provisions requiring overtime payment. California, for example, represents that its forestry service employees are under special arrangements for the 5–8 month forest fire campaign program, which are dependent as a practical matter on a compensatory time off arrangement during the winter months. Salt Lake City fears it may not be able to continue its practice of working its snow removal employees some 7,000 hours in excess of 40 hours per week during the winter with an equal amount of time off during the summer, despite the apparent acceptability of this arrangement to both employer and employees.

and local governments reflect costs of non-supervisory personnel, and that the budgeting processes currently under way indicate that the amendments may have the practical impact of a large scale reconstitution of tours of duty, without any factual predicate showing that there has been in the past any substantial degree of either widespread labor unrest curtailing flow of interstate commerce or substandard wage scales. They contend that the amendments here will intrude upon the state's performance of essential governmental functions far more than did those reviewed in *Wirtz*, although here, as there, the federal requirements are nominally limited to wage and hour regulations. We are troubled by these contentions, and consider that they are substantial and that it may well be that the Supreme Court will feel it appropriate to draw back from the far-reaching implications of *Wirtz*; but that is a decision that only the Supreme Court can make, and as a Federal district court we feel obliged to apply the *Wirtz* opinion as it stands.

If, as we must assume, the amendments are constitutional, a preliminary injunction would be inappropriate. We have pondered the possibility of relief pending appeal, to assure opportunity to litigate, but, apart from jurisdictional doubts, we apprehend that the only assistance available from such relief would be this, that states failing to comply with the new provisions would not be exposed to the liquidated damages and double damage penalties provided for bad faith violations of the Act. However, we feel that since our opinion recognizes that plaintiffs have raised a substantial question regarding the amendments' constitutionality, this will be sufficient to indicate that the claim of the part of the cities and

states that the Act cannot be constitutionally enforced has been raised in good faith.

Plaintiffs' request for declaratory and preliminary injunctive relief is denied. Defendant's motion for dismissal is hereby granted. Because the papers before us include depositions and affidavits, and they should be part of the record in the event of an appeal to the Supreme Court, our order dismissing the complaint will be entered under both Rule 12 and Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The foregoing will constitute our findings of fact and conclusions of law.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED, pursuant to and in accordance with Rules 12 and 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, that the complaint of the National League of Cities, et al., as amended December 31, 1974, and the complaint in intervention of the State of California, be, and they hereby are, dismissed with prejudice.

HAROLD LEVENTHAL
United States Circuit Judge

OLIVER GASCH
United States District Judge

BARRINGTON D. PARKER
United States District Judge

December 31, 1974

Counsel for Plaintiffs:
Charles S. Rhyne
Rhyne & Rhyne
400 Hill Building
839 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Counsel for Plaintiffs-Intervenors The State of California et al.:
Talmadge R. Jones
Deputy Attorney General
of the State of California
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 550
Sacramento, California 95814

Counsel for Defendant:
Nathan Dodell
Assistant United States Attorney
Room 3427
United States District Courthouse
Washington, D.C. 20001

EXHIBIT B

OFFICE COPY
ATTORNEY GENERAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, et al.,
Plaintiff/Appellants,

and

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Plaintiffs-Intervenors/Appellants,

and

THE STATE OF INDIANA, et al.,
Plaintiffs-Intervenors/Appellants,

v.

THE HONORABLE PETER J. BRENNAN,
Defendant/Respondent.

Civil Action
No. 74-1812

FILED
JAN 8 1975
JAMES F. DAVEY
CLERK

NOTICE OF APPEAL
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Notice is hereby given that the State of California, et al., plaintiffs-intervenors/appellants, hereby appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the final Order dismissing the Complaint and Complaint in Intervention in this action, entered on December 31, 1974.

This Appeal is taken pursuant to 28 USC § 1253.

EVELLE J. YOUNGER,
Attorney General
of the State of California

WILLARD A. SHANK
Assistant Attorney General

TALMADGE R. JONES
Deputy Attorney General

By TALMADGE R. JONES
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 550
Sacramento, California 95814
Telephone: (916) 445-6668
Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Intervenors/Appellants

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that I have served the foregoing Notice of Appeal upon defendant by mailing a copy, postage prepaid, this 3rd day of January, 1975, to Nathan Dodell, Esq., Assistant United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, United States Court House, Third and John Marshall Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, and to Mr. Lawrence Wallace, Deputy Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 20530.

EVELLE J. YOUNGER,
Attorney General of the State of California

WILLARD A. SHANK
Assistant Attorney General

TALMADGE R. JONES
Deputy Attorney General

By TALMADGE R. JONES
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 550
Sacramento, California 95814
Telephone: (916) 445-6668
Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Intervenors/Appellants

EXHIBIT C

STATUTES INVOLVED

The validity of the following provisions of Title 29 of the United States Code, § 201, *et seq.*, repealed or amended by the Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1974 (Pub. L. 93-259; 88 Stats. 55), are in issue herein:

"§ *203. Definitions*

"As used in this chapter—

" * * *

"(d) 'Employer' includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee and includes a public agency, but does not include any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer) or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

"(e) (1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the term 'employee' means any individual employed by an employer.

"(2) In the case of an individual employed by a public agency, such term means—

"(A) any individual employed by the Government of the United States—

"(i) as a civilian in the military departments (as defined in section 102 of Title 5),

"(ii) in any executive agency (as defined in section 105 of such title),

"(iii) in any unit of the legislative or judicial branch of the Government which has positions in the competitive service,

"(iv) in a nonappropriated fund instrumentality under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces, or

"(v) in the Library of Congress;

"(B) any individual employed by the United States Postal Service or the Postal Rate Commission; and

"(C) any individual employed by a State, political subdivision of a State, or an interstate governmental agency, other than such an individual—

"(i) who is not subject to the civil service laws of the State, political subdivision, or agency which employs him; and

"(ii) who—

"(I) holds a public elective office of that State, political subdivision, or agency,

"(II) is selected by the holder of such an office to be a member of his personal staff,

"(III) is appointed by such an officeholder to serve on a policy-making level, or

"(IV) who is an immediate adviser to such an officeholder with respect to the constitutional or legal powers of his office.

"* * *

"(h) 'Industry' means a trade, business, industry, or other activity, or branch or group thereof, in which individuals are gainfully employed.

"* * *

"(r) 'Enterprise' means the related activities performed (either through unified operation or common control) by any person or persons for a common business purpose, and includes all such activities whether performed in one or more estab-

lishments or by one or more corporate or other organizational units including departments of an establishment operated through leasing arrangements, but shall not include the related activities performed for such enterprise by an independent contractor: *Provided,* That within the meaning of this subsection, a retail or service establishment which is under independent ownership shall not be deemed to be so operated or controlled as to be other than a separate and distinct enterprise by reason of any arrangement, which includes, but is not necessarily limited to, an agreement (1) that it will sell, or sell only, certain goods specified by a particular manufacturer, distributor, or advertiser, or (2) that it will join with other such establishments in the same industry for the purpose of collective purchasing, or (3) that it will have the exclusive right to sell the goods or use the brand name of a manufacturer, distributor, or advertiser within a specified area, or by reason of the fact that it occupies premises leased to it by a person who also leases premises to other retail or service establishments. For purposes of this subsection, the activities performed by any person or persons—

"(1) in connection with the operation of a hospital, an institution primarily engaged in the care of the sick, the aged, the mentally ill or defective who reside on the premises of such institution, a school for mentally or physically handicapped or gifted children, a preschool, elementary or secondary school, or an institution of higher education (regardless of whether or not such hospital, institution, or school is public or private or operated for profit or not for profit), or

"(2) in connection with the operation of a street, suburban or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus carrier, if the rates and services of such railway or carrier are subject to regulation by a State or local agency (regardless of whether or not such railway or carrier is public or private or operated for profit or not for profit), or

"(3) in connection with the activities of a public agency,

shall be deemed to be activities performed for a business purpose.

"(s) 'Enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce' means an enterprise which has employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or employees handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person, and which—

"(1) during the period February 1, 1967, through January 31, 1969, is an enterprise whose annual gross volume of sales made or business done is not less than $500,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated) or is a gasoline service establishment whose annual gross volume of sales is not less than $250,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated), and beginning February 1, 1969, is an enterprise whose annual gross volume of sales made or business done is not less than $250,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated);

"(2) is engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothing or fabrics;

"(3) is engaged in the business of construction or reconstruction, or both;

"(4) is engaged in the operation of a hospital, an institution primarily engaged in the care of the sick, the aged, the mentally ill or defective who reside on the premises of such institution, a school for mentally or physically handicapped or gifted children, a preschool, elementary or secondary school, or an institution of higher education (regardless of whether or not such hospital, institution, or school is public or private or operated for profit or not for profit); or

"(5) is an activity of a public agency.

Any establishment which has as its only regular employees the owner thereof or the parent, spouse, child, or other member of the immediate family of such owner shall not be considered to be an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or a part of such an enterprise, and the sales of such establishment shall not be included for the purpose of determining the annual gross volume of sales of any enterprise for the purpose of this subsection. The employees of an enterprise which is a public agency shall for purposes of this subsection be deemed to be employees engaged in commerce, or in the production of goods for commerce, or employees handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce.

"* * *

"(x) 'Public agency' means the Government of the United States; the government of a State or political subdivision thereof; any agency of the United States (including the United States Postal Service and Postal Rate Commission), a State, or a political subdivision of a State; or any interstate governmental agency."

"§ *206. Minimum wage*

"* * *

"(b) Every employer shall pay to each of his employees (other than an employee to whom subsection (a)(5) of this section applies) who in any workweek is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and who in such workweek is brought within the purview of this section by the amendments made to this chapter by the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966, title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, or the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1974, wages at the following rates:

"(1) not less than $1.90 an hour during the period ending December 31, 1974,

"(2) not less than $2 an hour during the year beginning January 1, 1975,

"(3) not less than $2.20 an hour during the year beginning January 1, 1976, and

"(4) not less than $2.30 an hour after December 31, 1976."

"§ *207. Maximum hours*

"* * *

(k) No public agency shall be deemed to have violated subsection (a) of this section with respect to the employment of any employee in fire protection activities or any employee in law enforcement activities (including security personnel in correctional institutions) if—

"(1) in a work period of 28 consecutive days the employee receives for tours of duty which in the aggregate exceed 240 hours; or

"(2) in the case of such an employee to whom a work period of at least 7 but less than 28 days applies, in his work period the employee receives for tours of duty which in the aggregate exceed a number of hours which bears the same ratio to the number of consecutive days in his work period as 240 hours bears to 28 days,

compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed."

"§ *213. Exemptions*

"(a) The provisions of section 206 (except subsection (d) in the case of paragraph (1) of this subsection) and section 207 of this title shall not apply with respect to—

"* * *

"(b) The provisions of section 207 of this title shall not apply with respect to—

"* * *

"(7) any driver, operator, or conductor employed by an employer engaged in the business of operating a street, suburban or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus

carrier (regardless of whether or not such railway or carrier is public or private or operated for profit or not for profit), if such employee receives compensation for employment in excess of forty-eight hours in any workweek at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed, or

"* * *

"(20) any employee of a public agency who is employed in fire protection or law enforcement activities (including security personnel in correctional institutions);"

"*§ 216. Penalties; civil and criminal liability; injunction proceedings terminating right of action; waiver of claims; actions by Secretary of Labor; limitation of actions; savings provision.*

"* * *

"(b) Any employer who violates the provisions of section 206 or section 207 of this title shall be liable to the employee or employees affected in the amount of their unpaid minimum wages, or their unpaid overtime compensation, as the case may be, and in in an additional equal amount as liquidated damages. Action to recover such liability may be maintained against any employer (including a public agency) in any Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employees similarly situated. No employee shall be a party plaintiff to any such action unless he gives his consent in writing to become such a party and such

consent is filed in the court in which such action is brought. The court in such action shall, in addition to any judgment awarded to the plaintiff or plaintiffs, allow a reasonable attorney's fee to be paid by the defendant, and costs of the action. The right provided by this subsection to bring an action by or on behalf of any employee, and the right of any employee to become a party plaintiff to any such action, shall terminate upon the filing of a complaint by the Secretary of Labor in an action under section 217 of this title in which restraint is sought of any further delay in the payment of unpaid minimum wages, or the amount of unpaid overtime compensation, as the case may be, owing to such employee under section 206 or section 207 of this title by an employer liable therefor under the provisions of this subsection.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to supervise the payment of the unpaid minimum wages or the unpaid overtime compensation owing to any employee or employees under section 206 or 207 of this title, and the agreement of any employee to accept such payment shall upon payment in full constitute a waiver by such employee of any right he may have under subsection (b) of this section to such unpaid minimum wages or unpaid overtime compensation and an additional equal amount as liquidated damages. The Secretary may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction to recover the amount of the unpaid minimum wages or overtime compensation and

an equal amount as liquidated damages. The right provided by subsection (b) of this section to bring an action by or on behalf of any employee and of any employee to become a party plaintiff to any such action shall terminate upon the filing of a complaint by the Secretary in an action under this subsection in which a recovery is sought of unpaid minimum wages or unpaid overtime compensation under sections 206 and 207 of this title or liquidated or other damages provided by this subsection owing to such employee by an employer liable under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, unless such action is dismissed without prejudice on motion of the Secretary. Any sums thus recovered by the Secretary of Labor on behalf of an employee pursuant to this subsection shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary of Labor, directly to the employee or employees affected. Any such sums not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of three years shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. In determining when an action is commenced by the Secretary of Labor under this subsection for the purposes of the statutes of limitations provided in section 255(a) of this title, it shall be considered to be commenced in the case of any individual claimant on the date when the complaint is filed if he is specifically named as a party plaintiff in the complaint, or if his name

did not so appear, on the subsequent date on which his name is added as a party plaintiff in such action."

o